

Appl. No. 10/716,685
Atty. Docket No.: 2003B111
Amtd. dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Status – Request for Reconsideration

Reconsideration of this application is requested. The claims presented for reconsideration are claims 26-28, 30-49, 71-75, and 77-93.

Independent claims 26 and 71 have been amended to include the limitations of now canceled claims 29 and 76, respectively. Accordingly, no new matter is entered by way of this Amendment and Response.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant previously elected to prosecute the subject matter of Group I of the restriction requirement. Since the restriction requirement has been maintained, this amendment cancels the claims of Group II, claims 50-70. Applicant, therefore, reserves the right to further prosecute the subject matter of those claims by way of a divisional application.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action pointed out that the IDS filed August 24, 2004 indicated that two pages were included in the IDS, but only one was received in the PTO. Applicant notes that the IDS contains a clerical error, and that there was no second page in the submitted IDS. Therefore, the IDS was complete as filed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-2, 17-18, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,441,262 (hereinafter Fung). Those claims having been canceled by this amendment, renders this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 8-16 and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent to Fung. Since those claims have been canceled by this amendment, this rejection moot.

Appl. No. 10/716,685
Atty. Docket No.: 2003B111
Amdt. dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2006

Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent to Fung, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,822,825 (Bhattacharya), U.S. Patent No. 4,751,248 (Lin), U.S. Patent No. 4,752,263 (Stevens), and U.S. Patent No. 6,114,279 (Fukui). Those claims having been canceled by this amendment, renders this rejection moot.

Claims 26-49 and 71-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent to Fung in view of Bhattacharya, Lin, Stevens, and Fukui. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration requested.

This invention is particularly directed to a process for producing light olefins. According to the claimed process, a first syngas stream is contacted with a methanol synthesis catalyst to form a methanol-containing stream. In addition, a second syngas stream is contacted with a fuel alcohol synthesis catalyst to form a fuel alcohol-containing stream. At least a portion of the methanol-containing stream is combined with at least a portion of the fuel alcohol-containing stream to form a combined stream having a methanol to C2-C4 alcohol weight ratio of from about 0.1 to about 4.0. The combined stream is then contacted with a molecular sieve catalyst composition to form an olefin composition. The olefin composition that is formed can be varied in ethylene and propylene content by using the combined stream to produce the desired product.

Fung discloses a method of making an ethylene, propylene, and butylene product. According to the disclosed method, the product is made by contacting a molecular sieve catalyst with an oxygenate to convert a portion of the oxygenate to a product containing olefin. The catalyst is separated from the olefin product and a portion of the separated catalyst is directed to a regenerator for regeneration. The regenerated catalyst is then contacted with an alcohol selected from methanol, ethanol, 1-propanol, 1-butanol, or mixtures thereof. The relative amounts of ethylene, propylene, and butylene produced by the process is in part dependent upon the composition of the alcohol used to contact the regenerated catalyst.

Fung differs from the claimed invention in that Fung does not disclose or suggest contacting a first syngas stream with a methanol synthesis catalyst to form a methanol-containing stream; contacting a second syngas stream with a fuel alcohol synthesis catalyst to form a fuel alcohol-containing stream; combining at least a portion of the methanol-containing stream with at least a portion of the fuel alcohol-containing stream to form a combined stream having a

Appl. No. 10/716,685
Atty. Docket No.: 2003B111
Amdt. dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2006

methanol to C2-C4 alcohol weight ratio of from about 0.1 to about 4.0; and then contacting the combined stream with a molecular sieve catalyst composition to form an olefin composition.

The secondary references, Bhattacharya, Lin, Stevens, and Fukui, were cited for disclosing that different catalysts can be used in the manufacture of alcohol compositions, with varying degrees of types of alcohol product produced. However, none of Bhattacharya, Lin, Stevens, or Fukui combined with Fung suggests the manufacture of two different alcohol containing streams, and then combining those streams to form a combined stream having a methanol to C2-C4 alcohol weight ratio of from about 0.1 to about 4.0. There is also no combination that would suggest the degree of variability that can be achieved in the olefin product that is ultimately formed according to the claimed process. Accordingly, the combination of any one or more of the secondary references with Fung fails to suggest the claimed invention.

Appl. No. 10/716,685
Atty. Docket No.: 2003B111
Amdt. dated April 10, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2006

CONCLUSIONS

Having demonstrated that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the invention as claimed, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests early and favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated, since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2003B111).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 10, 2006
Frank Reid
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,918

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Telephone No. (281) 834-1743
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495